

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of T.D.A., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WANDA ANDERSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ANDRE BETTY,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
November 1, 2002

No. 240077
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-386946

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Wilder and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Anderson appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

A neglect petition was filed in March 2002, due to respondent's alcohol abuse and lack of suitable housing. As of the time of the hearing, respondent had not completed alcohol abuse treatment and had not established that her alcoholism was under control by providing weekly screening. Additionally, respondent had failed to obtain suitable housing. Given that respondent had not corrected these problems after more than one and one-half years, the trial court did not err in concluding that it was not likely that respondent would be able to correct these problems within a reasonable time. Thus, we conclude the trial court did not clearly err in finding that at least one statutory ground for termination had been proved by clear and convincing evidence. In *re IEM*, 233 Mich App 438, 450; 592 NW2d 751 (1999).

Further, the trial court did not clearly err in its determination that the evidence, on the whole record, did not clearly show that termination was clearly not in the child's best interest. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCL 712A.19b(5). While the

evidence established that there was a strong bond between the child and respondent, the evidence also established that the child was in alternate placement for nearly two years and was no closer to returning home than at the outset of the case due to respondent's failure to comply with the parent-agency agreement. Therefore, the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child. *Trejo, supra* at 356-357.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder
/s/ Brian K. Zahra